



15 AF

PTO/SB/21(09-06)

Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	10/782,098
		Filing Date	February 19, 2004
		First Named Inventor	Carmen Flosbach
		Group Art Unit	1796
		Examiner Name	Rabon A. Sergent
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	FA1224 US NA

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request (1 mo.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate of Mailing • Receipt Card
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	Remarks	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP		
Signature			
Printed Name	Hilmar L. Fricke		
Date	July 10, 2008	Reg. No.	22,384

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent via first class mail to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patent, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature	Ellen M. Godfrey		
Typed or printed name		Date	July 10, 2008

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patent
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 10, 2008

Date

Signature

Ellen M. Godfrey

Type or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Application No.: 10/782,098

Filing Date: February 19, 2004

First Named Inventor: Carmen Flosbach

Title: Process for the Production of Polyurethane Di(Meth)Acrylates

Attorney Docket: FA1224 US NA

- Transmittal Form
- Reply Brief
- Receipt Card

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE APPLICATION OF:
CARMEN FLOSBACH, ET AL.

APPLICATION NO.:
10/782,098

FILED:
FEBRUARY 19, 2004

FOR:
**PROCESS FOR PRODUCTION OF
POLYURETHANE DI(METH)ACRYLATES**

GROUP ART UNIT:
1796

EXAMINER:
RABON A. SERGENT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.:
FA1224 US NA

REPLY BRIEF

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF—PATENTS
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41, the following is a reply brief, filed in triplicate, in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed on May 14, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS	3
II.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	3
III.	ARGUMENT	3
	A. APPLICANTS' CLAIMS 1, 4, 7, AND 10 ARE UNOBTINIOUS AND PATENTABLE OVER WO 01/25359 (US 6,825,241)	3
IV.	CONCLUSION	5

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Appellants canceled Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-9. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10 remain in the case. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are the subject of this Appeal. No claims have been allowed.

II. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over WO 01/25359 (US 6,825,241) equivalent to US 6,825,241 to Blum, *et al.* (*hereinafter*, "Blum").

III. ARGUMENT

In the Examiner's Answer, the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 was maintained as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Blum. According to the Examiner, Blum discloses polyurethane diacrylates and powder coatings derived from polyurethane diacrylates, wherein the polyurethane diacrylates are produced from the reaction of hexane diisocyanate with ethylene glycol, butanediol, and hydroxyethyl acrylate in a molar ratio that meets the claimed ratios, specifically a molar ratio that corresponds to appellants' ratio where the "X" variable equals 2.5.

In the declarations submitted, comparisons of Appellants' Examples to that of Blum showed superior and unexpected results. Appellants prepared Examples where X values were at 2, 3 and 4 which all gave superior results to Blum having an X value of 2.5. However, the Examiner suggests that Appellants have not demonstrated superiority for X = 2.5. Appellants respectfully submit that such showing is unnecessary. Appellants suggest viewing the data in terms of molar percentage of hexane diisocyanate ("HDI") instead of the X value because the X value is simply a derivative of the HDI mole percentage. This exercise shows the closeness of the data points, that is, X = 2, 2.5, 3, and 4 as a result of the showing in the original HDI mole percent terms.

The relationship of the X values of hexane diisocyanate in mole percent are as follows:

- X value at 2 is equivalent to HDI mole percent at 40%**
- X value at 2.5 is equivalent to HDI mole percent 41.6%**
- X value at 3 is equivalent to HDI mole percent 42.8%**
- X value at 4 is equivalent to HDI mole percent 44.4%**

Thus, in terms of the HDI mole percent, it is clear that the data points are proximate to each other and the artificial broadening of the range when expressed in X terms disappears. Table 1 below compares typical results of the acid resistance testing set forth in the first declaration of Appellant's invention in comparison to Blum.

TABLE 1

X value of HDI	Mole % of HDI	Examples	Acid Resistance
X = 2	40.0%	Invention Ex. 1	12
X = 2.5	41.6%	Blum	9 Failed
X = 3	4.28%	Invention Ex. 2, 3, 5, 6	11- 23
X = 4	44.4%	Invention Ex. 4	12

Clearly Appellants have shown in the declaration that compositions with X values of 2, 3, and 4 provide superior acid resistance results in comparison to the Example of Blum.

In fact, when expressed in HDI mole percent, the difference in molar percent between X = 2 and X = 2.5 is merely 1.6% and between X = 3 and X = 2.5, only 1.2%. With such proximity of the HDI mole percent data point at 41.6% to values of X = 2 and X = 3, that is, a mere 1.6% mole percent separation from the data point on its left side, and a mere 1.2% separation from the data point on its right side, there can not be any doubt that superior results over Blum would be achieved at the X = 2.5 level. If the end results for X = 2.5 were to differ, if at all, it would be only by an insignificant amount to those at X = 2 and 3. Clearly, Appellants have demonstrated a scope that is commensurate to that of the claim. In such a situation, the burden shifts to the Examiner to at least provide some facts or data that are contrary to the information provided herein and not simply reject the clear data presented that show superior results to the cited prior art by assuming an arbitrary position that X at 2.5 was not illustrated in the declaration.

Appellants further submit that MPEP 716.02(e) states that “[a]n affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR [§] 1.132 must compare the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art to be effective to rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re*

Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979). . . . [However, w]here the comparison is not identical with the reference disclosure, deviations therefrom should be explained, *In re Finley*, 174 F.2d 130, 81 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1949), and if not explained should be noted and evaluated, and if significant, explanation should be required. *In re Armstrong*, 280 F.2d 132, 126 USPQ 281 (CCPA 1960) (deviations from example were inconsequential)."

Applying this legal framework to the present case, Appellants compared the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art (Blum) to rebut the Examiner's *prima facie* case of obviousness. Because according to the Examiner, the comparison was not identical (Appellants disagree, but nevertheless), Appellants determined the significance of the deviation, which, in similarity to the Armstrong case, is "inconsequential." Specifically, Appellants determined that the a difference in HDI mole percent of 1.6% between X=2 and X=2.5, and of 1.2% between X=2.5 and X=3, falls within the category of being inconsequential. Therefore, the declaration submitted by Appellants is effective to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is respectfully requested to reverse the final rejection of pending Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10, and indicate allowability of all claims.

Please charge any fee due which is not accounted for to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

Respectfully Submitted,

By:


HILMAR L. FRICKE, ESQUIRE
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS
REGISTRATION No.: 22,384
PHONE: 302-984-6058
FAX: 302-658-1192

Date: July 10, 2008